

Mark F. James (5295)
Mitchell A. Stephens (11775)
Justin L. James (15167)
JAMES DODGE RUSSELL & STEPHENS, P.C.,
10 W. Broadway, Suite 400
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 363-6363
Email: mjames@jdrslaw.com
mstephens@jdrslaw.com
jjames@jdrslaw.com

Counsel for Casey Davies

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH

AARON JAMES and TIFFANY JAMES,
Heirs and Proposed Personal Representatives
of the Estate of Zane James,

Plaintiffs,
vs.

CASEY DAVIES, and COTTONWOOD
HEIGHTS;

Defendants.

**SHORT FORM MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER TO KEEP
GARRITY STATEMENT
CONFIDENTIAL**

Case No. 2:19-CV-341 HCN DBP

Judge Howard C. Nielson, Jr.
Magistrate Judge Dustin B. Pead

RELIEF REQUESTED/INTRODUCTION

Defendant, Casey Davies (“Officer Davies”), pursuant to the Court’s standard protective order and the Parties’ agreement, moves the Court for a protective order to keep Officer Davies’ *Garrity* Statement “Confidential” to prevent Plaintiffs from publicly filing the document.

There are at least two reasons the Court should require Officer Davies’ *Garrity* statement to be kept confidential: *First*, Utah law mandates that *Garrity* statements are protected. *Second*, a

criminal investigation is currently pending against Officer Davies’ and public release of the *Garrity* statement risks tainting the investigation.

First, the Utah legislature recently passed a new bill that designates *Garrity* statements to be a protected governmental record and not subject to public access. [See Utah H.B. 399](#), 2022 General Legislative Session (amending Utah Code § 63G-2-305 to defined *Garrity* statements as a “protected record.” While the Bill has not been signed into law, it is awaiting the Governor’s signature.¹

Second, the Salt Lake County District Attorney’s Office recently re-opened their criminal investigation of Officer Davies. In *In re. Grand Jury Subpoenas*, the Tenth Circuit addressed whether immunized statements presented to a grand jury violated the police officer’s Fifth Amendment rights. 40 F.3d 1096. The Tenth Circuit held that production of the statements to a grand jury did not violate a police officer’s right. *Id.* at 1105. In reaching its conclusion, the Tenth Circuit noted that “adequate safeguards are in place to ensure that a police officer’s privilege against self-incrimination is not violated.” *Id.* at 1104. One of those “safeguards” was various policies ensuring that the immunized statements are “never seen by...the government attorney handling the case,” because such statements are “sanitize[d]” “**by redacting statements** and fruits of statements.” *Id.* at 1103. Publicly filing Officer Davies’ *Garrity* statement blows past this safeguard, and, at best, unnecessarily complicates the re-opened criminal investigation.

Accordingly, Officer Davies’ *Garrity* statement should be kept CONFIDENTIAL under the Court’s standard protective order as well as any statements contained therein.

¹ According to <https://le.utah.gov/~2022/bills/static/HB0399.html>, last accessed March 14, 2022, the Bill was sent to the Governor’s Office for signature on March 14, 2022; see also <https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/utah/articles/2022-03-04/governor-to-sign-law-keeping-some-police-statements-secret> (indicating that Govenor Cox stated “he will sign [the] bill[.]”), last accessed March 14, 2022.

CERTIFICATION

The Parties have met and conferred on this issue twice. First, the parties met and conferred on February 24, 2022, at approximately 4:00 pm. At that conference the Parties agreed to keep the *Garrity* statement confidential, without waiver of any right to challenge the CONFIDENTIALITY. On March 8, 2022, at approximately 1:00 pm, counsel for Plaintiffs indicated his desire to challenge the designation and file publicly the *Garrity* statement, at which time the parties met and conferred in good faith.

JAMES DODGE RUSSELL STEPHENS, PC

/s/ Justin L. James
Mitchell A. Stephens
Justin L. James

Attorneys for Officer Davies